



United States District Court For the Northern District of California

Dockets.Justia.com

only when the circumstances of a particular case indicate that appointed counsel is necessary to prevent due process violations. <u>See Chaney v. Lewis</u>, 801 F.2d 1191, 1196 (9th Cir. 1986).

Petitioner has thus far been able to adequately present his claims for relief. Respondent has been ordered to produce the state record, which may include petitioner's state appellate briefs prepared by counsel. No evidentiary hearing appears necessary in this case, nor are any other extraordinary circumstances apparent. Accordingly, the court concludes that appointment of counsel is not necessary at this time. Petitioner's second motion for appointment of counsel (docket no. 67) is DENIED without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: <u>4/14/09</u>

mala m whyte

RONALD M. WHYTE United States District Judge

Order Denying Motion for Appointment of Counsel P:\PRO-SE\SJ.Rmw\HC.01\Harris193.2dDenyAtty.wpd

United States District Court For the Northern District of California